



PATENT APPLICATION

#8
11/4/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Yoshitaka SASAKI et al.

Group Art Unit: 3599-2652

Application No.: 10/057,946 ✓

Examiner: W. J. Klimowicz

Filed: January 29, 2002

Docket No.: 111836

For: THIN-FILM MAGNETIC HEAD AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURING SAME, AND
SLIDES OF THIN-FILM MAGNETIC HEAD AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURING
SAME

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION AND ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

OCT 28 2003

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

In reply to the October 9, 2003 Restriction/Election of Species Requirement,
Applicants provisionally elect Group I, claims 4-7, 9 and 19-32 and also elects Species I,
Figures 1-28, with traverse. Claims 1-16, 19-24 and 26-32 are readable on the elected
species and are generic to all species.

A proper basis for Restriction does not exist. The product and method both deal with
bonding. Group I, for example, independent claim 1, recites, *inter alia* the recording head
section and the reproducing head section are bonded to each other. Therefore, the product
recited in Group I cannot be made by a materially different process of integrally forming via
an electroplating means as alleged.

Further, the method of Group II, for example, independent claim 4, recites, *inter alia*
bonding the recording head section and the reproducing head section to each other.

Therefore, the Restriction Requirement fails to establish that the product could be made from a material different process.

It is also respectfully submitted that the subject matter of all claims 1-32 and species I - IV are sufficiently related that a thorough search for the subject matter of any one Group of claims and species would encompass a search for the subject matter of the remaining claims and species. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the search and examination of the entire application could be made without serious burden. See MPEP §803 in which it is stated that "if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions" (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that this policy should apply in the present application in order to avoid unnecessary delay and expense to Applicants and duplicative examination by the Patent Office.

Thus, withdrawal of the Restriction and Election of Species Requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Ian R. Vallejo
Registration No. 53,714

JAO:IRV/dap

Date: October 27, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--